DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 191 390 HE 013 068

AUTHOR Rogers, James L.
TITLE Comprehensive Planning in a Journalism Department.
PUB DATE Oct 80
NOTE 38p.: Paper presented at the Southwest Syposium for Mass Communications/Journalism (College Station, TX, October, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Administration: *Departments: Educational Objectives: Educational Planning: Higher Education: *Journalism: Long Range Planning: *Organizational Objectives: Program Budgeting: *Program Development: *Student Educational Objectives
IDENTIFIERS *North Texas State University

ABSTRACT

The experience of the North Texas State University journalism department in undertaking a process for planning and budgeting is described. General observations on university planning and budgeting are followed by the considerations that are relevant in planning for journalism education. University and department level planning for the 1980-84 period was completed in the summer of 1979. The Program Classification Structure of the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems was adapted to provide the university program structure, and each department devised its own outline of departmental programs in relation to the university structure. Instruction, research, and public service output goals of the university and four support programs were considered. The development of the journalism plan invclved the following steps: developing goals for the department: developing planning assumptions for the department: identifying and organizing the department's programs and functions: developing a statement of strategies for goal attainment and identifying the resources required and the priorities assigned to the strategies: and developing evaluation techniques which include outcome measures. A sample of the instruction goals and examples of the use of goal statements, strategies, resources, priorities, and outcome measures are presented. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED191390

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING IN A JOURNALISM DEPARTMENT

Paper presented at the Southwest Syposium for Mass Communications/Journalism, Texas Journalism Education Council, College Station, Texas, October 1980, by

James L. Rogers
Professor of Journalism
North Texas State University
Denton, Texas 76203

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James L. Rogers

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 013 068

James L. Rogers
Professor of Journalism
North Texas State University
Denton, Texas
August 1979

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING IN A JOURNALISM DEPARTMENT

Continued enrollment increases in their programs have tended to shield journalism departments from the often-enunciated "imperative" of higher education for the 1980s: to plan for improved program quality with declining enrollment and resources under conditions of rapid inflation and economic uncertainty. As more universities undertake the development of comprehensive planning systems, however, the impact of the accountability movement is reaching into more departments. This paper discusses the experience of one journalism department in a university's development of a process for planning and budgeting, that of North Texas State University.

The Background for Planning

Whereas "planning" once tended to refer to physical plant and campus planning or perhaps to curriculum development, the current decade has brought efforts to integrate academic, administrative, financial, and facilities planning for the whole institution and its main components.[1] Planning processes tend to be centrally controlled by committees composed mostly of administrators. A 1976 survey revealed that "faculty participation either in the development of planning systems [or] in the . . . planning processes has been minimal." Nevertheless, "trustees, faculty members, and students are demanding greater participation." The survey concluded that "effective planning must provide for broad participation."[2]

Nevertheless, most university planning efforts have encountered a heavy resistance to planning by both administrators and faculty members. From the departmental viewpoint, particularly, this opposition may arise from a concern over loss of autonomy and fear that control over academic decisions will pass into administrative (and thus unqualified) hands. The struggle for departmental autonomy is not a new one, but it is intensified by fears of the planning process. Paradoxically, the department "has become the potent force, both in determining the stature of the university and in hampering the attempts of the university to improve its effectiveness and adapt to changing and economic requirements."[3] This has been attributed to the rapid growth of increasingly specialized departments together with the inability of the central administration to keep up with the details of operating a highly complex university. As a result,

> . . . the autonomy that has allowed departments to grow and prosper contributed to the growing pressure for accountability at all institutional levels. Departments are still the basic organizational unit and the "heart" of the institution, although the perpetuation of the organizational integrity of the department, rather than the development and transmission of a segment of knowledge, may in fact have become the primary thrust of departments in today's institutions.[4]

In studies in 1970 and 1972, Dressel examined the roles of departments in the achievement of university goals. The conclusion of his first study was that the "university and the departments within them are out of control." Reorganization for management was recommended to ensure that "resources are allocated and used in accord with the priorities set for the university by the university in cooperation with those who support it."[5] The sequel to that report found that faculty and departmental resistance to planned

change remained a problem, commenting that "no structure observed has been able to curb or satisfy the faculty's desire for disciplinary based structures corresponding to their graduate school preparation and their research."[6] The study further commented that institutions had failed to develop institutional roles congruent with the needs of their constituencies:

> Most faculty members and departments seem to have operated on the principle that what is good for them is good for the university; and, in turn, the university seems to have operated on the principle that what is good for the university is good for society. But, in fact, what they perceive as good for the university is not necessarily needed by, wanted by, or good for society.[7]

Anderson has pointed out that discipline-based departments are at the heart of the modern comprehensive university:

> Although members of the disciplines have teaching responsibilities, their ultimate purpose is scholarship and research. . . . They represent the fundamental purpose or mission of the university and its value system."[8]

In short, much departmental resistance to planning could be explained by a conflict between traditional disciplinary goals and some newly articulated goals of students in particular and of society in general. Indeed, the 1972 Return to Responsibility identified various constraints on departments that were considered justifiable and reasonable if they meet these conditions:

> . . . (1) tend to make students' educational experience more interesting, challenging, and relevant to social needs; (2) provide policies that are both necessary and fair as judged by students and the general public; (3) encourage or ensure more efficient use of resources; and (4) permit effectiveness and success to be judged by results and costs rather than by faculty or student preferences for particular educational processes.[9]

Several interesting explanations for this increasing conflict between traditional departmental autonomy and contemporary pressures for greater responsiveness may be found in Drucker's account of

"why service institutions do not perform."[10] He rejects the popular contention that a service institution such as a university will perform only if it is managed in a businesslike manner:

> The service institution has performance trouble precisely because it is not a business. What businesslike means in a service institution is control of cost. What characterizes a business, however, is control by performance and results. It is effectiveness and not efficiency which the service institution lacks. Effectiveness cannot be obtained by businesslike behavior as the term is understood, that is, by greater efficiency.
>
> To be sure, there is need for efficiency in all institutions. Because there is usually no competition in the service field, there is no outward and imposed cost control on service institutions as there is for business in a competitive (and even an oligopolistic) market. But the basic problem of service institutions is not high cost but lack of effectiveness. They may be very efficient -- some are. But they tend not to do the right things.[11]

Drucker's analysis suggests that the most overlooked basic difference between a service institution and a business is the way the service institution is paid. Whereas businesses are paid when they are able to obtain payment for producing what the customer wants, service institutions are paid out of a budget allocation from a general revenue stream. This means, says Drucker, that "they are not paid for what taxpayer and customer mean by results and performance." His summary says much about the problem facing academic departments today:

> Being paid out of a budget allocation changes what is meant by performance, or results. Results in the budget-based institution mean a larger budget. Performance is the ability to maintain or to increase one's budget. Results, as the term is commonly understood, that is, contributions to the market or achievement toward goal and objectives, are, in effect, secondary. The first test of a budget-based institution and the first requirement for its survival is to obtain the budget. And the budget is not, by definition, related to contribution but to good intentions.[12]

Finally, says Drucker, "being budget-based makes it even more difficult to abandon the wrong things, the old, the obsolete." Although he refers primarily to government agencies, his comment says much about the pressures being exerted on universities: "All service institutions are threatened by the tendencies to cling to yesterday rather than to slough it off, and to put their best and ablest people on defending what no longer makes sense or serves a purpose."[13]

Drucker's analysis offers the best explanation for the trend toward accountability in higher education: "We have no choice but to learn to manage the service institutions for performance. And they can be managed for performance."[14] This sentiment is virtually identical to the fourth item on the list of justifiable constraints on the academic department previously cited: "permit effectiveness and success to be judged by results and costs."

Planning for Journalism Education

The journalism department which attempts to plan for results in this setting must continue to take into account another basic goal conflict. I refer to that between "a liberal education" and "professional education." Anderson noted that the traditional discipline-based departments are humanistic oriented and largely confined to the liberal arts and sciences. By contrast, he notes, "The essence of the professional school is that it is strictly accountable in a formal way for its success or lack of success in educating persons for professional service."[15] The journalism department thus faces possible conflict over goals with arts and

sciences departments on its own campus. It must also accommodate both career-oriented and liberal arts goals within the department, there being a significant body of opinion that journalism education itself offers substantial liberal arts components.[16]

Unfortunately, it is easier for an organization to accommodate a wide range of apparently divergent goals at a time when the organization is growing and its resources are expanding. But when units must compete for the shrinking resources of an organization under unfavorable conditions, goal conflicts tend to intensify. The planning task is made more difficult by the fears (sometimes justified) of the discipline-oriented faculty that the accountability measures to be applied to them will be those that are easily quantified rather than those that are not so easily subject to measurement, such as the quality of teaching. (Indeed, there are those who suggest that departmental personnel committee succumb to the same temptation and use the quantifiable measures such as numbers of publications and size of research grants as the standard for promotion and tenure, rather than the more elusive indicators of quality of performance.)

Fortunately, a well-conceived planning process offers the hope of a rational resolution of some of these problems. The faculty of a journalism department can develop the means of planning programs which recognize the contribution of various goals to a total departmental effort. Similarly, a sound university planning process can help to demonstrate to other discipline-based departments the significance of their departmental contributions to the effectiveness of the journalism programs. The accomplishment of these results, however, demands that the entire university approach the comprehensive

planning process on the basis of goal-oriented university programs rather than on the basis of allocating resource increments to the traditional budget units.

Where does a journalism department turn for help in implementing program-based planning? The literature on the subject has literally exploded in quantity in the 1970s.[17] Especially influential have been the projects and publications of the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. In particular, the NCHEMS document, Academic Unit Planning and Management,[18] offers specific tools for departmental planners, and a newer handbook on academic and program planning[19] provides guidelines for the total university planning process.

The NTSU Experience

Development of a planning and budgeting process began at North Texas State University in July 1975 with the creation of a task force by the university president. Its members were faculty members, academic administrators, and general administrators. This group worked with all campus departments to develop a set of criteria for the development of a planning process. Perhaps the most important of these was the statement that "The process must provide for widespread involvement of those who will be expected to implement the plans and who will be directly affected by the process." This led to the call for volunteer units to serve as pilot groups. The task force selected 20 budget units to help plan, design, and test a system for producing university and departmental five-year and one-year plans, from which would also come biennial requests for legislative appropriations and annual university budget requests.

The NTSU Journalism Department volunteered to serve as a pilot unit and was one of 10 academic departments chosen. Details of the developmental efforts of the task force and its pilot units are available in two rather long documents through the Educational Resources Information Center file.[20] The university as a whole and each of its budget units, both academic and nonacademic, began implementation of the process in September 1978. Departmental and school/college plans for the 1980-84 period were completed in the summer of 1979. The rest of this paper discusses the experience of the Journalism Department in that process.

To accomplish program rather than incremental planning, a university program structure is required. This provides a common basis for all departments in evaluating their contributions to the total university and to the programs of other departments. One such organizing aid is the Program Classification Structure of NCHEMS.[21] This PCS was adapted to provide a North Texas State University Program Structure; each department, in turn, devised its own outline of departmental programs in relation to the university structure. Three primary programs are directed toward the accomplishment of the output goals of the university:

1.0 Instruction

2.0 Research

3.0 Public Service.

Four support programs include activities necessary or useful for the successful operation of the primary programs:

4.0 Academic Support

5.0 Student Services

6.0 Institutional Administration

7.0 Physical Plant Operations

Each program contains a number of subprograms, as indicated in Table 1. This outline then became the basis for the development of university goals for the five-year plan. These were developed over a semester's time by a faculty committee with contributions from the entire faculty and administrative staff. After approval by the central administration and the Board of Regents, the goals were given to each department as a pattern for departmental goal statements. A similar process was follwed in the development of planning assumptions for the university and the department. These covered such areas as forecasts of economic conditions, enrollment trends, state and federal influences, and other external factors.

The Journalism Department's plan, then, had to be tied to the university plan through the mechanisms of common assumptions and goals based on a program classification structure. These mechanisms enabled the appropriate dean (Arts and Sciences) and other administrators to coordinate the journalism plan with those of other units.

Table 2 reproduces the seven questions which were directed to each budget unit on the campus. Providing the answers constitutes the seven steps in the planning process for the department. The calendar called for academic departments to produce their plans first and to communicate their requirements to the appropriate support departments. The Journalism Department, for example, generated five-year needs which had to be integrated into the plans of the

TABLE 1

NTSU Program Structure* (Revised 1-16-79)

DEFINITION: A "program" is an aggregation of activities which contribute toward achieving a common set of goals or objectives. (See Step 3 of Appendix F for a fuller definition and discussion of how the term is used.)

The NTSU program structure is to be used in the preparation of five-year plans and annual plans. Its purpose is to provide a common format for the plans, which will aid in communication across university units.

Note there are seven program areas and these are classified as either "primary programs" (INSTRUCTION, RESEARCH, and PUBLIC SERVICE) or as "support programs" (ACADEMIC SUPPORT, STUDENT SERVICES, INSTITUTIONAL ADMINISTRATION, and PHYSICAL PLANT OPERATIONS). Each program area is subdivided into subprograms. The program areas and subprograms are outlined below. Definitions and examples are given on the pages which follow.

PRIMARY PROGRAMS: Activities directly related to the accomplishment of the primary goals of the university.

1.0 INSTRUCTION
- 1.1 General Academic Instruction
- 1.2 Community Education
- 1.3 Preparatory/Remedial Programs

2.0 RESEARCH
- 2.1 Institutes and Research Centers
- 2.2 Individual Project Research

3.0 PUBLIC SERVICE
- 3.1 Patient/Client Services
- 3.2 Community Services

SUPPORT PROGRAMS: Activities that are necessary or useful for the successful operation of the primary programs.

4.0 ACADEMIC SUPPORT
- 4.1 Library Services
- 4.2 Museums and Galleries
- 4.3 Educational Media
- 4.4 Academic Computing Support
- 4.5 Ancillary Support
- 4.6 Academic Administration
- 4.7 Course and Curriculum Development
- 4.8 Academic Personnel Development

5.0 STUDENT SERVICES
- 5.1 Student Service Administration
- 5.2 Social and Cultural Development
- 5.3 Counseling and Career Guidance
- 5.4 Financial Aid Administration
- 5.5 Student Auxiliary Services
- 5.6 Intercollegiate Athletics
- 5.7 Student Health/Medical Services

6.0 INSTITUTIONAL ADMINISTRATION
- 6.1 Executive Management
- 6.2 Financial Management and Operations
- 6.3 General Administrative and Logistical Services
- 6.4 Administrative Computing Support
- 6.5 Faculty and Staff Auxiliary Services
- 6.6 Public Relations/Development
- 6.7 Student Recruitment and Admissions
- 6.8 Student Records

7.0 PHYSICAL PLANT OPERATIONS
- 7.1 Physical Plant Administration
- 7.2 Building Maintenance
- 7.3 Custodial Services
- 7.4 Utilities
- 7.5 Landscape and Ground Maintenance
- 7.6 Major Repairs and Renovation

*The NTSU program structure is a modification of the structure developed by the National Center for Higher Education Management Stystems (NCHEMS) as given in Program Classification Structure, 2nd edition, Technical Report 106, 1978.

TABLE 2

PREPARING THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN -- SEVEN STEPS

WHEN TO PREPARE THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN: Spring semester 1979.

PLAN PERIOD: For the five years beginning Sept. 1, 1980 and ending Aug. 31, 1985.

In preparing the five-year plan, you are asked to consider the questions listed below. The plan for each department should contain these elements, written as succinctly and coherently as possible.

1. *Five years from now, what should your department and this university be like?*	GOALS
2. *What problems, opportunities, and constraints must be faced in getting there?*	PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS
3. *How will you organize for achieving your goals?*	Outline of PROGRAMS and FUNCTIONS
4. *How do you plan to reach these goals? (Strategies)* *What will it cost? What will be needed in money, staff, facilities, equipment, supplies, and services? What support services from other units will be needed? (Resources)* *What comes first, second, and so on? (Priorities)*	STRATEGIES, RESOURCES, and PRIORITIES
5. *How will you know when you get there?*	OUTCOMES and EVALUATION
6. *Are there issues, programs, or projects which your department wishes to include for further study in the continuation of planning activities? Can you suggest improvements in the planning process which would help your department?*	ITEMS FOR FURTHER STUDY
7. *What are the major points of the plan which should go into a brief summary?*	DIGEST

Print Shop, the Computing Center, the Media Production Center, and the Media Library. At each level, from department through university, the goal is to attach a priority judgment to each major planning strategy. The priorities are to be used in the allocation of existing funds, in requests for appropriations, and in decisions to seek external gifts and grants. The priority levels, or categories of emphasis, are these:

1. First priority. Extremely important -- implementation of the strategy and accomplishment of the goal will be emphasized ahead of other goals and strategies.

2. Second priority. Important -- will be emphasized as necessary for accomplishment within the five-year period.

3. Third priority. Desirable -- will be given attention to the extent that time and resources permit.

Development of the Journalism Plan

With the university goals and planning assumptions in hand, members of the journalism faculty carried out the following steps:

1. GOALS. Develop goals for the department.

From the university program structure and following the general goals statement for the university, goals were selected for the areas indicated in Table 3. It may be seen that the department does not define a goal for every subprogram covered in the university outline -- only for those which are seen to be relevant to the departmental mission. The departmental goal statement covered 11 typewritten pages. A sample of the instruction goals is shown in Table 4 and of support goals in Table 5.

TABLE 3

Journalism Department Goal Areas

1. INSTRUCTION

   1.1 General Academic Instruction

      1. Academic Development
      2. Career Preparation
      3. Advanced Training
      4. Intellectual Orientation

   1.2 Community Education

2. RESEARCH

   2.1 Individual Project Research

3. PUBLIC SERVICE

   3.2 Community Services

4. ACADEMIC SUPPORT

   4.1 Library Services

   4.3 Educational Media

   4.4 Academic Computing Support

   4.5 Ancillary Support: The North Texas Daily

   4.6 Academic Program Advising

   4.7 Course and Curriculum Development

   4.8 Academic Personnel Development

5. STUDENT SERVICES

   5.2 Student Social/Cultural Development

   5.3 Job Placement

6. INSTITUTIONAL ADMINISTRATION

   6.3 General Administration and Logistical Services

   6.6 Public Relations/Development

   6.7 Student Recruitment

TABLE 4

Sample Departmental Goals: Instruction

1. ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENT
   1. Ensure that students acquire a good basic knowledge in the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences.
   2. Help students acquire a good basic knowledge in areas of broad concern in journalism/mass communications:
      a. Social and legal rights and responsibilities of the mass media.
      b. Technology's impact on the media.
      c. The processes of mass communication.
      d. The effects of mass communication.
      e. The role of various career fields in the social and economic life of the U. S. and the world.
   3. Help students acquire depth of knowledge in at least one discipline within the department degree programs.
   4. Hold students to high standards of intellectual performance and professional competence.
   5. Prepare some students for advanced study in graduate school.
   6. Ensure that students develop a high level of mastery of written and oral communication skills.
2. CAREER PREPARATION
   1. Provide education for specific career fields, including news-editorial positions in print and broadcast media, advertising, photojournalism, public relations, and business journalism.
   2. Prepare students for immediate entry into the job market.
   3. Assist students in deciding upon a career field.
   4. Provide retraining opportunities for those whose career skills have become rusty or obsolete or for those who wish to improve or enlarge career skills.
3. ADVANCED TRAINING
   1. Offer graduate work leading to the master's degree in journalism.

TABLE 4 (Cont.)

4. INTELLECTUAL ORIENTATION
   1. Develop students' ability to synthesize knowledge from a variety of sources.
   2. Train students in methods of problem definition and solution, scholarly inquiry, and research.
   3. Help students develop their intellectual capacities to the fullest.
   4. Instill in students a permanent commitment to learning.
   5. Increase the desire and ability of students to undertake self-directed learning.

5. COMMUNITY EDUCATION
   1. Continue to develop noncredit instruction for those employed in journalistic careers and for others interested in improving journalistic skills, with emphasis on:
      a. Refresher seminars to improve or expand career competence.
      b. Education geared toward new and emerging career techniques and fields.
      c. Application of communication skills to career areas other than those usually thought of as "journalistic."

TABLE 5

JOURNALISM DEPARTMENT GOALS: ACADEMIC SUPPORT

4.1 LIBRARY SERVICES

1. Provide in the holdings of the University Library the learning resources needed to support the academic programs of the department.

2. Develop a collection of materials in the Journalism Reference Room which will provide for students:

   a. The opportunity to learn from a significant number of U. S. newspapers of recognized high quality.

   b. Ready access to major news magazines and magazines of the journalistic professions.

   c. Laboratory- and publications-related use of a good general collection of current reference works.

3. Provide greater emphasis in courses on development of student awareness of library resources, skill in use of library materials, and general abilities (and actual performance) in information search and retrieval techniques as a part of both learning experiences and professional skill development.

4.3 EDUCATIONAL MEDIA

1. Emphasize additions to the Media Library which will enhance student learning in all degree program sequences of the department.

2. Provide locally prepared media materials to support all sequences.

4.4 ACADEMIC COMPUTING SUPPORT

1. Enable each student in the news-editorial sequence to become competent in the use of VDT system at a professional level.

2. Provide a computer-aided instruction in stylebook usage, writing, and copy editing.

3. Develop use of computer simulation and gaming for instruction in newspaper management and advanced advertising courses.

TABLE 5 (Cont.)

4.5 ANCILLARY SUPPORT: THE NORTH TEXAS DAILY

Provide laboratory experiences for students enrolled in journalism classes. Qualitative improvement goals for the Daily will be indicated as follows:

1. Each Daily staff member will prepare copy on VDT terminals.

2. Some 50 to 75 percent of Daily copy will be written and edited on VDTs, producing punched tape for the Print Shop.

3. Faculty advisory load assignments will be re-evaluated (see committee report of March 29, 1979).

4.6 ACADEMIC PROGRAM ADVISING

The departmental program will support the university goal: to provide each student with readily available, accurate, and continuing program advising. Results expected will include:

1. Each student will file a degree plan no later than the completion of 30 semester hours of study.

2. By the time he has completed 60 semester hours of undergraduate study, no student will have enrolled for more than 12 hours of journalism courses.

3. Elective choices will be controlled within the limits of the degree plan.

4. Transfer students should have an advisory program prior to registering for the first semester at NTSU.

4.7 COURSE AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Develop a continuing review process for the improvement of journalism courses. Emphasis will be given to course development in response to the 1979 accreditation report from the American Council on Education for Journalism:

1. Provide beginning journalism students with improved understanding of social/legal rights and responsibilities of the mass media and of the process and effects of mass communication.

2. Ensure that skills courses (reporting, writing, editing, advertising production) increase emphasis on:

   a. Social responsibility.

   b. Awareness of current media problems and activities.

2. PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS. Develop planning assumptions for the department.

The university planning assumptions forecast a five-year continuation of inflation averaging seven percent per year and a national unemployment rate fluctuating around the six percent rate. For the Dallals-Fort Worth metropolitan area, however, employment conditions were forecast to remain more favorable than national trends. A variety of changes in the enrollment mix were forecast, but few increases in student population. The five-year planning assumptions for the Journalism Department noted the "probability" of creation of a community VHF television facility in Denton, offering major opportunities for development of broadcast journalism programs. A franchised cable television system will begin operation by the start of the five-year planning period, and this, too, is expected to create major educational opportunities for journalism students. Career oppotunities for news-editorial majors are expected to remain strong, and business growth in the metropolitan area should accelerate rapid expansion of the department's programs in advertising and public relations. In all, 11 areas of opportunities for departmental programs were listed in the planning assumptions. On the negative side, the assumptions cited seven significant areas of problems and constraints. These dealt with an unfavorable (to the department) university policy on tenure and promotion, the admission of unqualified international students, rigidity of the university curriculum, problems in graduate program development, state purchasing difficulties, and inadequate student preparation.

3. PROGRAMS AND FUNCTIONS. Identify and organize the department's programs and functions.

This stage of planning encourages faculty members to discuss the way in which they wish to organize to carry out their activities. The instructional programs identified tended to be classified into "functions" which constitute the sequences of undergraduate degree offerings. In the other areas, the decisions on what to list as the programs and functions served to identify the department's needs, its priorities, and the results it plans to achieve. Some management writers would refer to these groupings of important functions as "key result areas." Questions that need to be answered during this step include the following:

1. Are there any functions that our department would like to discontinue? Should we include any new ones?

2. Should (or can) we carry out our existing functions with the same level of resources and activities?

Are our goals congruent with university goals? If not, do we need to change our goal or do we need to influence a revision of a university goal?

4. Does this outline of programs and functions adequately reflect our current position and our department's direction?

5. Are there any needs or priorities to be met by the department that are not described by any of the functions in our outline?

6. To whom do we need to communicate our unit's functional inventory, other than the dean? Is there a need to get together with other departments to reach some common understandings about our departmental operations?

OUTLINE OF DEPARTMENT PROGRAMS AND FUNCTIONS

Form PB-21
NTSU 1/79

ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT: Journalism Department

Check One: [x] For FIVE-YEAR PLAN, Sept. 1, 1980 - Aug. 31, 1985

[ ] For ANNUAL PLAN, Budget Year Beginning Sept. 1, 1980

UNIVERSITY PROGRAM AREAS and SUBPROGRAMS as defined in the NTSU program structure	DEPARTMENT PROGRAMS. The name given a "department program" may be the same as a subprogram in the NTSU program structure or may be unique to the department.	DEPARTMENT FUNCTIONS. A "department function" is an activity (or set of activities) which forms a subset of a department program.
1.0 INSTRUCTION		
1.1 General Academic Instruction	General Academic Instruction	News-Editorial Sequence
		Public Relations Sequence
		Advertising Sequence
		Photojournalism Sequence
		Master's Degree Program
		Support to Related Programs (Radio-TV, Business Journalism, High School Teaching, Adverising Art, Home Economics, Recreation, Etc.)
1.2 Community Education	Community Education	Noncredit seminars and short courses
2.0 RESEARCH		
2.1 Individual Project Research	Individual Project Research	
3.0 PUBLIC SERVICE		
3.2 Community Services	Community Services	Judging Professional Contests
		Conducting University Interscholastic League Contests

TABLE 6

OUTLINE OF DEPARTMENT PROGRAMS AND FUNCTIONS

ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT: Journalism Department

Check One: [X] For FIVE-YEAR PLAN, Sept. 1, 1980 - Aug. 31, 1985
[ ] For ANNUAL PLAN, Budget Year Beginning Sept. 1, 1980

UNIVERSITY PROGRAM AREAS and SUBPROGRAMS as defined in the NTSU program structure	DEPARTMENT PROGRAMS. The name given a "department program" may be the same as a subprogram in the NTSU program structure or may be unique to the department.	DEPARTMENT FUNCTIONS. A "department function" is an activity (or set of activities) which forms a subset of a department program.
4.0 ACADEMIC SUPPORT		
4.1 Library Services	Library Services	Departmental Acquisitions for University Library
		Journalism Reference Room
4.3 Educational Media	Educational Media	Instructional Services Improvement
4.4 Academic Computing Support	Academic Computing	Talstar Reporting/Editing System Program Development
4.5 Ancillary Support	North Texas Daily (see also 5.2)	Use of Daily in Instructional Applications
4.6 Academic Administration	Academic Program Advising	Program Advising for Journalism Majors and Minors
4.7 Course and Curriculum Development	Course Development	Improving Course Offerings
4.8 Academic Personnel Development	Personnel Development	Improvement of Teaching
		Professional Meetings
5.0 STUDENT SERVICES		
5.2 Student Social and Cultural Development	North Texas Daily	Use of Daily as a Campus Service
	Student Professional Organizations	SDX, WICI, PRSSA, AAF, KTA
5.3 Counseling and Career Guidance	Counseling and Career Guidance	Job Placement

TABLE 6 (Cont.)

OUTLINE OF DEPARTMENT PROGRAMS AND FUNCTIONS

Form PB-21
NTSU 1/79

ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT: Journalism Department

Check One: [X] For FIVE-YEAR PLAN, Sept. 1, 1980 - Aug. 31, 1985

[ ] For ANNUAL PLAN, Budget Year Beginning Sept. 1, 1980

TABLE 6 (Cont.)

UNIVERSITY PROGRAM AREAS and SUBPROGRAMS as defined in the NTSU program structure	DEPARTMENT PROGRAMS. The name given a "department program" may be the same as a subprogram in the NTSU program structure or may be unique to the department.	DEPARTMENT FUNCTIONS. A "department function" is an activity (or set of activities) which forms a subset of a department program.
6.0 INSTITUTIONAL ADMINISTRATION		
6.6 Public Relations/ Development	Public Relations/Development	Relations With the Journalistic Professions
		Alumni Records and Communication
		Information Dissemination
		Fund Solicitation
6.7 Student Recruitment and Admissions	Student Recruitment	From High Schools
		From Community Colleges
		For Graduate Program

The nature of the answers generated by faculty discussions in the Journalism Department is suggested in the outline of department programs and functions, Table 6.

4. STRATEGIES, RESOURCES, PRIORITIES. Develop a statement of strategies for goal attainment, identifying the resources required and the priorities assigned to the strategies.

The heart of the five-year plan is generated through the completion of this step. Fore each goal, the faculty must identify the strategies which it proposes to undertake during the five-year period, determine whether additional resources will be required, and assign a priority rating to each strategy. The NTSU Journalism Department developed strategies for each of its goal statements in each of the programs and functions listed. At this stage, two advantages of the planning process begin to emerge: (1) The dean of the college and the academic vice president receive and review a statement of intentions of the departmental faculty and have the opportunity to evaluate and to respond concerning the desirability of a set of program strategies and the probabilities of attaining the resource levels necessary for effective accomplishment. (2) The department chairman and various departmental committees and individuals can determine the responsibility assignments necessary to convert the longer-range plans into one-year plans and to schedule the actions necessary for achieving specific annual objectives. Incorporated into this process almost simultaneously is the requirement of the next planning step.

5. OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION. Develop evaluation techniques which include outcome measures (i.e., indicators of success).

At this juncture, much university planning activity may falter and perhaps turn into an exercise in rhetoric. The success of the planning effort rests on the ability of the faculty to identify acceptable outcome measures for its program strategies. This is clearly the most difficult task in the planning effort. There has been a tendency on many campuses, including our own, to create plans for "programs of excellence." This often leads to the trap of regarding "excellence" as synonymous with "reputation" or "prestige." This is encouraged by national surveys of "quality" based on questionnaires as to which schools or programs are the most highly regarded by respondents.

No institution is likely to refuse the chance to acquire a favorable reputation or to be ranked among the more prestigious programs. Nonetheless, the essence of this planning philosophy is that excellence becomes a meaningful term to the degree that the journalism program (and the university) succeed in stating operational objectives with measurable outcomes. In this viewpoint, excellence is not equated with prestige; it is intended to indicate success in achieving stated objectives. For that reason, the NTSU plan gives its highest priority to the evaluation of program success. Among other things, this offers a dean a chance to evaluate a number of academic departments which stress quite different objectives. It enables comparison of a traditional discipline-oriented department with a career-oriented professional department. Or, it may enable a journalism department to house in harmony a program which is clearly career-preparation oriented with one which is theoretical and abstract in nature and purpose. The dean or chairman is not

pushed to label a program "excellent" if it resembles someone's notion of prestigious activity. Instead, he is freed to look upon the factor of effectiveness as the significant consideration.

Professional shop talk and the literature of journalism education have tended in the past to focus on the courses a future journalist should study -- so many semester hours of economics or political science or the like. The discussions usually emphasized the means rather than the desired results. Fortunately, in the past decade there has been more outcome-focused consideration of journalism education.[22] A great deal more work needs to be done in this area as an aid to planning. The writer is working on a classification of the potential outcomes of journalism programs in a structure that will match the outcomes study projects of the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.[23] It is hoped that this will enable the journalism department to focus even more sharply on the statement of goals and strategies in outcome terms.

The outcome measures suggested on the five-year plan tend to be less specific than those which will follow for the objectives of the annual plan. Examples of the use of the statements of goals, strategies, resources, priorities, and outcome measures are presented here for two of the instruction goals from the NTSU Journalism Department five-year plan.

1. Goal: Academic Development of Students

Strategies:

1. Revise course content to reflect the concern for student acquisition of basic knowledge in areas of broad concern in journalism and mass commmunications.

Develop Journalism 121 [freshman survey] as a course in Survey of Mass Communications to stress understanding of social and legal rights and responsibilities of the mass media, of the impact of technology on the media, of the processes and effects of mass communication, and of the role of the various career fields in the nation and the world.

Follow up at the upper levels to develop course objectives to assist in accomplishing this goal.

2. Increase classroom emphasis on student skills performance.

3. Develop a departmental testing program to require a high level of mastery of written and oral communication skills as a condition of program completion.

Resources:

1. Salaries: 1/3 salary of one professor for nine months for development and testing of the necessary program of skills measurement. $10,000

2. M and O: Purchase of standardized test materials, computer scoring, validation runs. $ 1,000

Priority: First.

Evaluation and Outcome Measures:

1. Development of the testing program, validation of its effectiveness, and at the end of five years, indication of a significant increase in student performance in the desired areas.

2. Goal: Career Preparation of Students

Strategies:

1. Develop a sustained program of student and faculty contacts with professionals through attendance at meetings, seminars, campus visits, field trips, internships, and practicum programs.

Resources:

1. M and O: Increase travel funds, $500 per year $2,500

Priority: First.

Support program activities are intended to mesh with the goals of the primary programs, as indicated by this academic support plan:

3. Goal: Academic Computing Support

Strategies:

1. Purchase eight additional terminals for the reporting laboratories.

2. Develop expanded software modules to provide computer-aided instruction for the Tal-Star system.

3. Use university computer Center terminals in developing assistance to students in newspaper management; add CRT terminals to provide simulation of newspaper business and advertising operations.

4. Lease access to national data bases for advertising research classes, Providing research experience in media trends, competitive expenditures, audience analysis, media scheduling, etc. Provide CRT terminal access for these advertising students, coupled with access to printer.

Resources:

1. VDT purchase, Tal-Star system: $65,520.

2. For items 2, 3, and 4 above, costs will be analyzed in the development of detailed plans during the coming year. These will be reported and requested in the next annual update of this plan.

Priority: First.

Outcome Measures:

1. Number of student contact hours of experience with writing and editing on terminals.

2. Performance of students on senior-level competence testing.

3. Evaluation by graduates after one or more years of professional employment to assess effectiveness and applicability of skills to employment situation.

4. Evaluation by employers of graduates.

5. Reduction in production costs of North Texas Daily.

Two other steps in the planning process listed in Table 2 call for a listing of the listings of items for further study and of the preparation of a digest of the plan. This latter feature is designed to preserve the time of the dean who must review the planning documents of a number of departments. It is divided into sections to facilitate evaluation and decision-making by the dean and vice president. A section on continuing programs states very briefly the department's intentions with respect to program effectiveness goals. New undertakings, judged to be "major thrusts" over five years, but requiring no new resources, constitute the second section. The final section of the digest identifies major new thrusts of first priority which <u>will</u> require added resources. Here the department identifies the five-year costs proposed for new faculty positions, increased departmental operating expense, capital equipment purchase, and additional facilities space. This approach enables the department chairman and the dean to sit down and review the forthcoming five years and to agree tentatively on their strategies for appropriations requests, for private fund development, and for budgetary allocation procedures and contingencies. While it does not guarantee a certain future, it does increase an understanding of the probabilities of future support and of what will be expected of the department in the way of performance.

Evaluation of the Process

After two years of the pilot studies at North Texas State Universities, the task force asked an outside interviewer to conduct a detailed study with the chairmen of the 20 pilot departments as to their evaluations of the process developed thus far. There was skepticism expressed by a number: "I remain unconvinced of its value." "This is generating reams of garbage." "This is being done because of political expediency." Others found some value in the experience: "It gave us opportunity to look at ourselves." "It has some positive outcomes. It has forced us to look at objectives." "I went from a feeling of resistance to an appreciation of planning." "I felt strait-jacketed at first but liked the later flexibility. It was good to look back and see what we had accomplished."

In their interviews (which provided anonymity), more than 90 percent of the pilot unit chairmen rated all 15 of the stated planning purposes as "very important" or "moderately important" on a four-point scale. Two-thirds or more rated the following nine purposes as "very important":

1. Clearer understanding of goals
2. More teamwork.
3. Greater effectiveness.
4. Participation in planning by those who must implement plans.
5. Greater efficiency.
6. Evaluation of results.
7. Clarification of responsibilities.
8. Less crisis-oriented management.
9. Improved resource allocation.

Of these nine "very important" purposes, seven were given "some chance" or "a very good chance" of being achieved. Budget chairmen were divided on the chances of success of the other two: greater efficiency and improved resource allocation.

Two major themes emerged from the pilot testing in which the Journalism Department participated. Department chairmen almost unanimously asked that the process and the instructions be simplified as much as possible. They were further convinced that for the planning to work on a university-wide basis in the future, all concerned would have to demonstrate that the process has an impact on decision making and is worth the effort.

The process and instructions were revised to produce the system which has been reviewed above for the Journalism Department. And the journalism chairman and others in the department who had been through the pilot development and testing agreed that the revisions were simpler and more effective. Only a great deal more effort and the completion of several more planning cycles will enable the participants to judge whether the impact on decision making in the university community has been worth the effort.

###

FOOTNOTES

1. Jack E. Freeman, "Comprehensive Planning in Higher Education," New Directions for Higher Education 19:33-52 (Autumn 1977).

2. Ibid.

3. Paul L. Dressel and Donald J. Reichard, "The University Department: Retrospect and Prospect," Journal of Higher Education 41:387-402 (May 1970).

4. Paul Dressel and Lou Anna Kimsey Simon, "Departmental Roles and Concerns," New Directions for Institutional Research 11:7-16 (Autumn 1976).

5. Paul L. Dressel, F. Craig Johnson, and Philip M. Marcus, The Confidence Crisis: An Analysis of University Departments (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970), p. 232.

6. Paul L. Dressel and W. H. Faricy, Return to Responsibility (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972), p. 87.

7. Ibid., p. 184.

8. G. Lester Anderson, "Organizational Diversity," New Directions for Institutional Research 10:1-20 (Summer 1976).

9. Dressel and Faricy, op. cit., p. 188.

10. Peter Drucker, Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices (New York: Harper and Row, 1974).

11. Ibid., P. 138.

12. Ibid., p. 142.

13. Ibid., pp. 145-46.

14. Ibid., p. 135.

15. Anderson, op. cit., p. 9.

16. Paul L. Dressel, Liberal Education and Journalism (New York: Institute of Higher Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1960).

17. D. Kent Halstead (ed.), Higher Education Planning: A Bibliographic Handbook (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1979).

18. Glenn K. Miyatake and Maureen L. Byers, Academic Unit Planning and Management, Technical Report 75 (Boulder, Colo.: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1976).

19. Raynond N. Kieft, Frank Armijo, and Neil S. Bucklew, A Handbook for Institutional Academic and Program Planning (Boulder, Colo.: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1978).

20. James L. Rogers, University Planning and Budgeting, ED 153 532 (Washington: Educational Resources Information Center, 1978). James L. Rogers, Guide to Planning and Budgeting, ED 153 533 (Washington: Educational Resources Information Center, 1978).

21. Douglas J. Collier, Program Classification Structure, Second Edition, Technical Report 106 (Boulder, Colo.: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1978).

22. For examples, see Proceedings: Education for Newspaper Journalists in the Seventies and Beyond (Washington: American Newspaper Publishers Association Foundation, 1974); Reed Sarratt, Albert T. Scroggins Jr., and Lloyd W. Brown Jr. (eds.), A Symposium: Education for Newspaper Work (Atlanta: Southern Newspaper Publishers Association Foundation, 1973); John Hulteng,

"What Editors and Journalism Educators Expect From Journalism Education," in Galen Rarick (ed.), News Research for Better Newspapers, Vol. 6 (Reston, Va.: American Newspaper Publishers Association Foundation, 1973); 1975 Newsroom Competencies and Staffing Study (Iowa Daily Press Association, 1975); Harold A. Fisher, "Broadcast Journalists' Perceptions of Appropriate Career Preparation," Journalism Quarterly 55:140-44 (Spring 1978).

23. Leonard Romney, Measures of Institutional Goal Achievement (Boulder, Colo.: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1978); Oscar T. Lenning et al., A Structure for the Outcomes of Postsecondary Education (Boulder, Colo.: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1977).